UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/945,188	08/31/2001	Shawn S. Cornelius	10022/54	3206

28164   7590   02/13/2009
ACCENTURE CHICAGO 28164
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P O BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, THUONG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2455	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/945,188
Filing Date: August 31, 2001
Appellant(s): CORNELIUS ET AL.

<div align="center">

John C. Freeman
<u>For Appellant</u>

</div>

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 12/15/08 appealing from the Office action

mailed 7/18/08.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

2002/0068631 A1	Raverdy	12-2000
5,758,126	Daniels	5-1998
6,445,774 B1	Kidder	11-1997

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2.   Claims 4, 17, 22 & 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It's unclear to the examiner coordinating the management to what of the technical parameter? What technical parameter the management trying to coordinate?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2-6, 17-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raverdy, Patent No. 2002/0068631 in view of Daniels, Patent No. 5,758,126.

Raverdy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including system and method to support gaming in an electronic network (see abstract).

5.   As to claim 4, Raverdy teaches a method for managing a remote data processing

system comprising:

communicating with a remote data processing system associated with a trading

partner on at least one technical parameter of the remote data processing system (page

4, paragraph 52 & 58; Raverdy discloses that the method of transferring ownership or

certified between trading participants to update or download the appropriate software

versions or determined the current version for an updating services), wherein the at

least one technical parameter includes information related to operation characteristics of

any one of the remote data processing system, the communications network and a base

data processing system in communication with the remote data processing system via

the communication network (page 3, paragraph 43 – page 4, paragraph 48; Raverdy

discloses that the method of providing the communication network information such as

user device, bi-directionally communication of the communication network and an I/O

interface between system);

receiving a message on the at least one technical parameter via the

communication network (figure 6 & 9; page 3, paragraph 37; Raverdy discloses that the

method of communicate directly with other user devices to perform various types of

procedures);

presenting the message on a user interface for review (figure 8; page 7,

paragraph 83-87; Raverdy discloses that the method of presenting the certified history

for review).

But Raverdy failed to teach the claim limitation wherein automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a trading group.

However, Daniels teaches customizable bidirectional EDI translation system (see abstract). Daniels teaches the limitation wherein automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a trading group (col 1, lines 20-45; col 2, lines 10-20; col 6, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Raverdy in view of Daniels so that the system would be able to perform in a simple and inexpensive way. One would be motivated to do so to required minimum human intervention.

6.   As to claim 2, Raverdy and Daniels teach the method as recited in claim 4 wherein the communicating comprises polling a remote business-to-business server as the remote data processing system to obtain the at least one technical parameter concerning an operational status of at least one of software and hardware of the remote business-to-business server (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of providing the appropriate configuration information to the particular user device corresponding the user profile).

7.   As to claim 3, Raverdy and Daniels teach the method as recited in claim 4 wherein the communicating comprises polling a remote business-to-business server at the remote data processing system to obtain the at least one technical parameter of at

least one of software and hardware of the remote business-to-business server (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of providing the appropriate configuration information to the particular user device corresponding the user profile).

8.   As to claim 5, Raverdy and Daniels teach the method as recited in claim 4 wherein the at least one technical parameter is selected from the group consisting of:

hardware configuration of the remote data processing system, hardware configuration of the base data processing system, software configuration of the remote data processing system, software configuration of the base data processing system, an installed version of a remote software module, an installed version of a base software module, an installed type of remote software module, an installed type of base software module, operational status data, performance metric data on performance of the remote data processing system, and performance metric data on performance of the base data processing system (page 1, paragraph 15; page 2, paragraph 16; Raverdy discloses that the method of determined the appropriate software version to install to particular user).

9.   As to claim 6, Raverdy and Daniels teach the method as recited in claim 4 wherein the at least one technical parameter comprises operational status data of at least one of the remote data processing system, the base data processing system, and the communications network (figure 1; page 2, paragraph 32; Raverdy discloses that the method of present the wireless telecommunication device configuration to a user devices).

10.   As to claim 17, Raverdy teaches a system for managing a remote data

processing system comprising:

a managing communications interface for supporting communication with a

remote data processing system associated with a trading partner on at least one

technical parameter of the remote data processing system (page 4, paragraph 52 & 58;

Raverdy discloses that the system of transferring ownership or certified between trading

participants to update or download the appropriate software versions or determined the

current version for an updating services), wherein the technical parameter data includes

information related to operation characteristics of any one of the remote data processing

system, the communications network and a base data processing system in

communication with the remote data processing system via the communications

network (page 3, paragraph 43 – page 4, paragraph 48; Raverdy discloses that the

method of providing the communication network information such as user device, bi-

directionally communication of the communication network and an I/O interface between

system);

monitor for receiving a report message on the at least one technical parameter

via the communications network (figure 6 & 9; page 3, paragraph 37; Raverdy discloses

that the method of communicate directly with other user devices to perform various

types of procedures); and

an interpreter for interpreting, without human intervention, the report message for

presentation on a user interface (figure 8; page 7, paragraph 83-87; Raverdy discloses

that the method of presenting the certified history for review).

But Raverdy failed to teach the claim limitation wherein automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a trading group.

However, Daniels teaches the limitation wherein automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a trading group (col 1, lines 20-45; col 2, lines 10-20; col 6, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Raverdy in view of Daniels so that the system would be able to perform in a simple and inexpensive way. One would be motivated to do so to required minimum human intervention.

11.   As to claim 18, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 17 wherein the remote data processing system comprises a remote business-to-business server (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the system of providing the appropriate configuration information to the particular user device corresponding the user profile).

12.   As to claim 19, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 17 wherein a presentation module for preparing a presentation of the report message on the user interface for review (figure 3).

13.   As to claim 20, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 17 wherein the at least one technical parameters is selected from the group consisting of:

hardware configuration of the remote data processing system, hardware

configuration of the base data processing system, software configuration of the remote

data processing system, software configuration of the base data processing system, an

installed version of a remote software module, an installed version of a base software

module, an installed type of remote software module, an installed type of base software

module, operational status data, performance metric data on performance of the remote

data processing system, and performance metric data on performance of the base data

processing system (page 1, paragraph 15; page 2, paragraph 16; Raverdy discloses

that the system of determined the appropriate software version to install to particular

user).

14.   As to claim 21, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 17

wherein the at least one technical parameter comprises operational status data (figure

6).

15.   As to claim 22, Raverdy teaches a system for managing a remote data

processing system comprising:

wherein the at least one technical parameter data includes information related to

operation characteristics of any one of the remote data processing system, the

communications network and a base data processing system in communication with the

remote data processing system via the communications network (page 3, paragraph 43

– page 4, paragraph 48; Raverdy discloses that the method of providing the

communication network information such as user device, bi-directionally communication

of the communication network and an I/O interface between system)

a data manager for retrieving reference technical parameter data from a

reference parameters storage (page 2, paragraph 16; Raverdy discloses that the

system of determined if the security provisions are not adequate for completing,

transferring procedure to determined if the user has appropriate encryption software,

which means the system has to retrieve the information stored in the server to

determined that condition); and

a data processor for determining whether the received technical parameter data

of the message complies with the retrieved reference technical parameter data (page 8,

paragraph 100; Raverdy discloses that the system of determined whether appropriate

versions of encryption software are currently installed to support the transfer procedure

between the trading partners).

monitor for receiving a report message on at least one technical parameter of a

remote data processing system via the communications network (figure 6 & 9; page 3,

paragraph 37; Raverdy discloses that the method of communicate directly with other

user devices to perform various types of procedures).

But Raverdy failed to teach the claim limitation wherein the remote data

processing system is revised automatically and without intervention of a user when the

received technical parameter data does not comply with the retrieved reference

technical parameter data.

However, Daniels teaches the limitation wherein the remote data processing

system is revised automatically and without intervention of a user when the received

technical parameter data does not comply with the retrieved reference technical

parameter data (col 1, lines 20-45; col 2, lines 10-20; col 6, lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Raverdy in view of Daniels so that the system would be able to

perform in a simple and inexpensive way. One would be motivated to do so to required

minimum human intervention.

16.   As to claim 23, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein a base communications interface adapted to poll the remote data processing

system associated with a trading partner on the at least one technical parameter of the

remote data processing system (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the

system of providing the appropriate configuration information to the particular user

device corresponding the user profile).

17.   As to claim 24, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein a managing communications interface for sending a revision to the remote data

processing system if the data processor determined that the same software modules

are not specified in the reference technical parameter data and the received technical

parameter data (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the system of

uploading an appropriate software version or encryption to the system).

18.   As to claim 25, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein a managing communications interface for sending a revision to the remote data

processing system if the data processor determined that the same software type of

software modules are not specified in the reference technical parameter data and the

received technical parameter data (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the

system of upgrading or updating the appropriate software version or encryption to the

system.

19.   As to claim 26, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein a managing communications interface for sending a revision to the remote data

processing system if the data processor determined that the same version of software

modules are not specified in the reference technical parameter data and the received

technical parameter data (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the system

of upgrading or updating the appropriate software version or encryption to the system.

20.   As to claim 27, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein the data processor is coupled to a storage device, the storage device including

at least one of a reference parameters storage, a received parameters storage, and an

upgrade module storage for storing upgrade software modules (page 6, paragraph 73-

74; Raverdy discloses that the system of updating or upgrading version software or

encryption for the particular software for the users).

21.   As to claim 28, Raverdy and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein the data manager and a user interface support a user's revision of reference

parameters of the reference parameters storage to add, delete, or modify at least one

software feature of the remote data processing system (figure 3 & 6).

22.   As to claim 30, Raverday and Daniels teach the system as recited in claim 22

wherein a user interface in communication with the monitor, wherein the user interface

displays a second message based on the determining whether the received technical

parameter data complies with the retrieved reference technical parameter data (figure 2 & 8).

23.   Claim 29, 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raverdy, Patent No. 2002/0068631 A1 in view of Daniels, Patent No. 5,758,126 and further in view of Kidder, Patent No. 6,455, 774 B1.

Raverdy teaches the invention substantially as claimed including system and method to support gaming in an electronic network (see abstract).

24.   As to claim 29, Raverdy teaches a method for managing a remote data, comprising:

wherein the technical parameter data includes information related to operation characteristics of any one of the remote data processing system, the communications network and a base data processing system in communication with the remote data processing system via the communications network (page 3, paragraph 43 – page 4, paragraph 48; Raverdy discloses that the method of providing the communication network information such as user device, bi-directionally communication of the communication network and an I/O interface between system)

retrieving reference technical parameter data from a reference parameters storage based on the message (page 2, paragraph 16; Raverdy discloses that the system of determined if the security provisions are not adequate for completing,

transferring procedure to determined if the user has appropriate encryption software, which means the method has to retrieve the information stored in the server to determined that condition); and

determining whether the received technical parameter data of the message complies with the retrieved reference technical parameter data (page 8, paragraph 100; Raverdy discloses that the method of determined whether appropriate versions of encryption software are currently installed to support the transfer procedure between the trading partners);

receiving on a monitor a message containing technical parameter data on a remote data processing system via the communications network (figure 6 & 9; page 3, paragraph 37; Raverdy discloses that the method of communicate directly with other user devices to perform various types of procedures);

displaying on a user interface confirmation that the revising has been completed (figure 8; page 7, paragraph 83-87; Raverdy discloses that the method of presenting the certified history for review).

But Raverdy failed to teach the claim limitation wherein automatically revising without user involvement, the remote data processing system should the determining indicates that received technical parameter data of the message does not comply with the retrieved reference technical parameter data; displaying on a user interface confirmation that the revising has been completed.

However, Daniels teaches the limitation wherein automatically revising without user involvement, the remote data processing system should the determining indicates

that received technical parameter data of the message does not comply with the

retrieved reference technical parameter data (col 1, lines 20-45; col 2, lines 10-20; col 6,

lines 30-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Raverdy in view of Daniels so that the system would be able to

perform in a simple and inexpensive way. One would be motivated to do so to required

minimum human intervention.

However, Kidder teaches system for automated workflow in a network

management and operations system (see abstract). Kidder teaches the limitation

wherein displaying on a user interface confirmation that the revising has been

completed (col 12, lines 28-50).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Raverdy in view of Kidder so that monitor the activities. One would

be motivated to do so to be able to resolve the problems and received the confirmation

once the processes completed.

25.   As to claim 8, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein polling a second remote data processing system that is associated with a

trading partner on the technical parameter data of the remote data processing system

(page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of providing the

appropriate configuration information to the particular user device corresponding the

user profile).

26.   As to claim 9, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein sending a revision to the remote data processing system if at least one

software component of the remote data processing system is noncompliant with the

reference technical parameter data (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that

the method of uploading an appropriate software version or encryption to the system).

27.   As to claim 10, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein sending an upgrade software module to the remote data processing system

if the same types of software modules are not specified in the reference technical

parameter data and the received technical parameter data (page 6, paragraph 73-74;

Raverdy discloses that the method of upgrading or updating the appropriate software

version or encryption to the system).

28.   As to claim 11, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

10 wherein installing the upgrade software module after receipt of confirmation that a

requisite hardware upgrade for supporting the upgrade software module has been

successfully completed (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of

installing an appropriate software version of encryption to the system).

29.   As to claim 12, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein delaying a transmission of a revision to the remote data processing system

if the same software components are not specified in the reference technical parameter

data and the received technical parameter data and if the remote data processing

system requires a hardware upgrade to support the revision (page 4, paragraph 52;

page 5, paragraph 61; Raverdy discloses that the method of determined if the software

application is outdated and if the software in the system is the right version and will

proceed the procedure accordingly).

30.   As to claim 13, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein sending a desired version of an upgrade software module to the remote

data processing system if the same versions of software modules are not specified in

the reference technical parameter data and the received technical parameter data (page

6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of upgrading or updating the

appropriate software version or encryption to the system).

31.   As to claim 14, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

13 wherein installing the desired version of the upgrade software module after receipt of

confirmation that a requisite hardware upgrade for supporting the desired version of the

upgrade software module has been successfully completed (page 6, paragraph 73-74;

Raverdy discloses that the method of installing an appropriate software version of

encryption to the system).

32.   As to claim 15, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein delaying a transmission of a desired version of an upgrade software module

to the remote data processing system if the same versions of software modules are not

specified in the reference technical parameter data and the received technical

parameter data and if the remote data processing system requires a hardware upgrade

to support the desired version of the upgrade software module (page 4, paragraph 52;

page 5, paragraph 61; Raverdy discloses that the method of determined if the software

application is outdated and if the software in the system is the right version and will

proceed the procedure accordingly).

33.   As to claim 16, Raverdy, Daniels and Kidder teach the method as recited in claim

29 wherein revising the reference parameters storage such that a reference

configuration is defined by the technical parameter data and includes a new feature for

installation at the remote data processing system (page 5, paragraph 60 & 68; Raverdy

discloses that the method of determined the appropriate technical parameter from the

user profile and upload or download the various types of information accordingly).

   (10) Response to Argument

-   Applicant's arguments filed 12/15/08 have been fully considered but they are not

    persuasive. In response to Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the

    rejection. A) Applicant stated that the 112 2nd paragraph rejection on

    "coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading

    partners within a trading group" are improper when the Examiner raised question

    on what technical parameter the system is trying to coordinate with the

    management? (page 20, paragraph 2); B) Raverdy does not teach "presenting

    the message on a user interface for review" (page 21, paragraph 2); C) Raverdy

    and Daniels do not teach or suggest "automatically, without user involvement,

    coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for trading

    partners within a trading group" (page 22, paragraph 1); D) Raverdy does not

    teach " delaying a transmission of a revision to the remote data processing

system if the same software components are not specified in the reference

technical parameter data and the received technical parameter data and if the

remote data processing system requires a hardware upgrade to support the

revision " (page 26, paragraph 3); E) Raverdy does not teach "installing the

desired version of the upgrade software module after receipt of confirmation that

a requisite hardware upgrade for supporting the desired version of the upgrade

software module has been successfully completed". (page 26, paragraph 3

In response to A); Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the 112 2nd paragraph rejection

on "coordinating the management of the at least one technical parameter for

trading partners within a trading group" when the Examiner raised question on

what technical parameter the system trying to coordinating with the management.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988

F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim limitation failed to

disclose what is the management trying to coordinating of the at least one

technical parameter automatically? Therefore, the 112 2nd paragraph rejection is

proper.

In response to B); Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection in response to

applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e.,

presenting technical parameter on a user interface for review) are not recited in

the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See

In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The

applicant only claims "presenting the message o a user interface for review".

Moreover, Raverdy disclose the method of presenting the information of the

activities of the users to review for updating (figure 8; page 7, paragraph 83-87).

Therefore, Raverdy discloses the claim limitation "presenting the message o a

user interface for review". Therefore, Raverdy meets the claim limitation.

In response to C); Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Raverdy

and Daniels do teach "automatically, without user involvement, coordinating the

management of the at least one technical parameter for trading partners within a

trading group" (col 1, lines 20-45; col 2, lines 10-20; col 6, lines 30-60; Daniels

discloses that the method of processing, accessing, generating information

required by the business or for trading partner automatically). Moreover,

Raverdy and Daniels disclose the method of automatic processed specific

standard in the trading partner's computer system without human intervention.

Therefore, Raverdy and Daniels meet the claim limitation.

In response to D); Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Raverdy

does teach "delaying a transmission of a revision to the remote data processing

system if the same software components are not specified in the reference

technical parameter data and the received technical parameter data and if the

remote data processing system requires a hardware upgrade to support the

revision " (page 4, paragraph 52; page 5, paragraph 61; Raverdy discloses that

the method of determined if the software application is outdated and if the

software in the system is the right version and will proceed the procedure

accordingly). Moreover, Raverdy discloses the method of determined if the

particular version of the application software is appropriate; if not then the system

will have perform an update procedure to determined the right version for the

software, it's a delaying process if the software is not updated. Therefore,

Raverdy meets the claim limitation.

In response to E); Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

Applicant's argument, the Patent Office maintains the rejection because Raverdy

does teach "installing the desired version of the upgrade software module after

receipt of confirmation that a requisite hardware upgrade for supporting the

desired version of the upgrade software module has been successfully

completed " (page 6, paragraph 73-74; Raverdy discloses that the method of

installing an appropriate software version of encryption to the system).

Moreover, Raverdy discloses the method of checking for the login information

along with receiving an access code which would provide appropriate

configuration information which is a form of receiving confirmation for the

identification of the corresponding user and location. Therefore, Raverdy meets

the claim limitation.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thuong (Tina) T Nguyen/

Examiner, Art Unit 2455

Conferees:

Saleh Najjar

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455

Thuong Nguyen

/Thuong (Tina) T Nguyen/

/ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457